

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIR			
09/819,446 03/28/2001		Jochen Kappel	51207-1070	2724		
22827 7:	590 07/18/2006	07/18/2006		EXAMINER		
DORITY & MANNING, P.A.			JASMIN, LYNDA C			
POST OFFICE GREENVILLE	BOX 1449 E, SC 29602-1449		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
014411114	, 00 22002 2112		3627			
			DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004	4		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/819,44	KAPPEL ET AL.					
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Lynda Jas		3627				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	tion appears on the	cover sheet with the c	correspondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF TH 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no ever cation. ary period will apply and wi by statute, cause the appl	IIS COMMUNICATION ont, however, may a reply be tin II expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 20 April 2006						
•		☐ This action is n	on-final.					
′=	<u> </u>							
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims	·						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.								
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
′	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.							
·								
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election re	equirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer						
			objected to by the	Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	e correction is require	ed if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	foreign priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of t	he priority docume	ents have been receive	ed in this National	Stage			
	application from the International	·	` ''					
* \$	See the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the certi	fied copies not receive	ed.				
Attachmen	' '							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	-048)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔲 Infor	r No(s)/Mail Date	•	5) Notice of Informal P		O-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

1. Response received April 20, 2006 has been acknowledged. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagan et al. (2001/0056362 A1), in view of Swartz et al. (2003/0074463).

Hanagan discloses a customer care and billing system having at least one database (via database server 29), a plurality of clients and at least one application server with accompanying clients (see box [298]) are communicating with the at least one database (29), and an appropriate framework (which provide support layer to the developer, and a base upon which business functionality can be developed), wherein relevant services corresponding to desired customers care and billing processes are offer (via all types of electronic transmission, such as wireless see boxes [0022]-[0044]). The system further includes distributed component architecture with components (12, 14, 16, 18 and 22) attributed in correspondence to the relevant services offered (box [0054]). Hanagan further discloses that the system in divided into at least two layer (as illustrated in figure 23), and at least two hierarchically arranged tiers corresponding to

technical tasks (as illustrated in Figure 24) wherein the combined elements of all tiers fulfill the tasks from the storage to the presentation of data over a network such as the Internet. Hanagan further discloses a lowest base layer (392) containing fundamental system behavior and a common layer (box [0296]). The system also a technical services layer (via technical application structure), and an application layer (via software layers 394). The system further includes a business layer containing the domain-specific classes for each component (via business application layers).

Although Hanagan discloses that the components can be integrated together into a system where the components work together, however, Hanagan fails to explicitly disclose that the components communicate with each other directly via interfaces.

Swartz et al. discloses the concept of interfacing core telecommunication system with local service provider. Swartz discloses the use of Local Service Activation Management System "LSAM" hereafter, which is a local service provisioning capability that enables a national and/or international service provider (NSP) to quickly enter into local markets while minimizing the implementation costs and risks. The LSAM system delivers an integrated technical architecture, which shares common integrated technical architecture with shared services and features across the application. The LSAM provides proactive status monitoring, and monitors transactions against transaction level service agreements. Further, as illustrated in Figure 14, the LSAM system interface provides the point of integration between LSAM and all NSP core systems. From this teaching of Swartz it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the billing and customer care system of

Application/Control Number: 09/819,446 Page 4

Art Unit: 3627

Hanagan to include the direct interface or interaction as taught by Swartz in order to deliver an integrated technical architecture which shares common integrated technical architecture with shared services.

Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments filed April 20, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the billing and customer care system of Hanagan to include the direct interface or interaction as taught by Swartz in order to deliver an integrated technical architecture which shares common integrated technical architecture with shared services.
- 6. Applicant's further argue, "Respectfully, per proper application and consideration of controlling case law, in order for Swartz to teach any obvious modification of Hanagan such that would result in formation of a system in accordance with the presently claimed subject matter, Swartz would have to teach that the various "local"

service providers" were capable of communicating with each other, in addition to communicating with the core telecommunications system for management purposes. Applicants have been unable to find any such teaching within Swartz." It is the Examiner's positions that Swartz discloses the service location validation functions validate the service location address with LSP1. The service location address is a key data entity for inquiring into available TNs from LSP1 as well as for ensuring that a successful interconnection will be supported between the LSP2 switch and the LSP1 loop.

Page 5

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/819,446 Page 6

Art Unit: 3627

8. Applicant's arguments having been found unpersuasive, thus the Office Action is made final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynda Jasmin whose telephone number is (571) 272-6782. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday (9:30-6:00) with Thursday Telework.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or \$71-272-1000.

Primary/Examiner Art Unit 3627